

congressional action designed to dismantle the pervasive regime of race and gender preferences that has been established by the Federal Government over the last 25 years.

Until recently, I do not think anyone truly recognized how widespread these Federal preferences really are. But in February of this year, at the request of Senator DOLE, the Congressional Research Service prepared a report collecting the Federal statutes and regulations that establish preferences based on race and gender.

CRS compiled a list of approximately 160 such Federal laws, some of which are statutory, but the large majority of which are buried in agency regulations relating to Federal contracting and employment and the administration of Federal programs.

Simply stated, the Federal Government is a major player in the business of granting preferences and imposing burdens on its citizens on the basis of race and gender.

Some of us find troubling the Congress' cavalier acceptance of this unjust situation, and I, as well as other Congressmen and Senators, have announced an intention to end the injustice through legislation prohibiting the use of race and gender preferences by the Federal Government.

I think the Court's decision in *Adarand* is a very significant step in the right direction. Most importantly, the Court's holding is driven by a recognition of the principle that must form the basis of any systematic review of Federal racial and gender preferences.

As Justice O'Connor explained for the majority, the equal protection clause "protect[s] persons, not groups."

This principle motivates my commitment to making sure that Congress picks up where the Court has left us. It is, as the Court emphasized, a matter of simple justice that the Government should not favor or disfavor any citizen on account of morally irrelevant characteristics like race and gender.

But this issue is about more than reverse discrimination. It is, at bottom, about the kind of society we want to live in. And on this point, I think defenders and opponents of racial preferences probably agree: We, as a society, are far too conscious of race. But we disagree on how best to cure this immoral focus on race. Ultimately, of course, we will only become a truly colorblind society when each of us commits to combating discrimination in our own actions and in the actions of those with whom we come into contact.

But insofar as Congress' role is concerned, there are two major things we can and must do. First, we must ensure that the Federal antidiscrimination laws are adequate to the task of prohibiting such discrimination, and that the enforcement agencies are vigorous and judicious in their enforcement efforts.

Second—and this is where I think we really need to make some changes—we should make sure that neither Congress nor the Federal Government do anything to require or encourage citizens to engage in the sort of race- and gender-conscious policies we purport to abhor.

On the point, I quite agree with the Court majority in *Adarand* when they wrote that program like racial set-asides "can only exacerbate rather than reduce racial prejudice," and indeed "will delay the time when race will become a truly irrelevant \* \* \* factor."

It was Justice Blackmun, of course, who wrote in the *Bakke* case that, "To get beyond racism, we must first take race into account." But the very notion that you cure an evil by engaging in that same evil is nonsense. Two wrongs do not make a right. Instead, we should pursue a firm commitment to the principle embodied in the Court's holding yesterday, and perhaps best captured by Justice Thomas' concurring opinion. He wrote:

I believe that there is a moral and constitutional equivalence between laws designed to subjugate a race and those that distribute benefits on the basis of race in order to foster some current notion of equality. Government cannot make us equal; it can only recognize, respect, and protect us as equal before the law.

I believe that a candid observer must conclude that Congress has participated in the creation of a pervasive system of discriminatory preferences and has thus failed to abide by the fundamental obligation imposed by the equal protection clause.

And so I welcome the Court's decision in *Adarand*. I hope and trust that my colleagues in the House and the Senate will follow the Court's lead and do what we can to restore to our Federal laws the principle of non-discrimination. We would do well to rededicate ourselves to the simple truth pointed out yesterday in Justice Scalia's characteristically poignant concurring opinion: "In the eyes of government, we are just one race here. It is American."

#### CAPITAL BUDGETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, what I want to do today is to announce that yesterday 36 of my colleagues and I sent to the President of the United States this letter. In this letter, what we do is to ask the President to consider capital budgeting as one approach to whatever budget eventually emerges from this Congress and in negotiations with Congress and the White House.

What is capital budgeting? Capital budgeting is very simple. It is what every family in this country does, it is what every business in this country

does, it is what every State and local government does. There is only one group that does not do it, and that is the Federal Government.

Capital budgeting simply says that you show your long-term investments, those things that bring you back more than you actually spend on them over time, separately from your operating expenses.

What we do in the Federal Government is a dollar spent for welfare is considered exactly the same as a dollar spent for bridges and infrastructure and research and development, for those things that are so important to make us grow.

That makes no sense. What we do is to ask that for the first time, the Federal Government operate on a capital budget that deals with physical infrastructure, the roads, the bridges, the airports, the water and sewer systems, the telecommunications networks, those things that are physical and have tangible value.

The reality is this country, for instance, spends far less in proportion to its budget than many of our industrial competitors. Japan, with half the population and about 60 percent of the economy that the United States has, spends more in real dollars on its infrastructure than the United States does. Then we wonder sometimes why we are having trouble competing.

What we ask is that we have capital budgeting. This Congress has a precedent with that. Both 2 years ago and again just a few months ago on the floor of this House when the constitutional amendment to balance the budget was up, last time 139 Members of the House voted for my amendment that would have permitted capital budgeting. We had a large vote before and a significant number of Republican Members as well as Democrat Members supported it 2 years earlier.

This offers to Republican leaders and to Democrat leaders a way to meet the balanced budget requirements, to introduce some appropriate accounting methods to bring the Federal Government into line with everyone else, and to encourage investment. Where do you get a win-win-win-win situation like this? Capital budgeting, I think, is crucial to this.

There is no doubt that our Nation's infrastructure is in need of replacement. I notice that one of the growth industries as I drive around the country seems to be orange barrels. Sometimes those orange barrels mean that construction is taking place. Other times those orange barrels mean there is simply a problem and we do not have the money to deal with it.

Almost half the Nation's bridges are in some way substandard. Two hundred twenty some thousand miles of highway needs some kind of immediate work. Clearly our infrastructure needs work, needs rebuilding and needs building. Capital budgeting permits that to happen.

There are going to have to be a lot of painful cuts in the balanced budget

proposal. Everyone understands that. There is going to be a legitimate debate about whether it takes 7 years to get to that goal or 8 years or 10 years. We all understand that.

There is going to be a lot of partisanship on this floor. That is a given. But it does seem to me that where we can find bipartisan solutions to meet this challenge of balancing the budget, we ought to be about that business.

Capital budgeting has been advanced very ably by Republican leaders such as the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], myself, and others. Capital budgeting is truly a bipartisan solution to many of the problems that face this Federal Government and its budgeting concerns.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, and the reason we have written the President is where else can you bring the Federal Government in line with every other accounting entity, bring the Federal Government in line with every business, with every family, with every State and local government? Where else can you get the Federal Government on an accounting system that is entirely appropriate? Where else can you get the Federal Government on a system that encourages investment, not discourages growth? Where else can you get the Federal Government actually moving faster toward a balanced budget and at the same time encouraging the growth that we think is so important?

The reality is we are going to have to encourage growth in any balanced budget proposal. You cannot simply cut your way to fiscal nirvana. Capital budgeting offers that. It is appropriate. Every CPA can tell you that. I hope that the President will follow up on this suggestion.

#### U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, like so many other Americans, I listened with great interest Sunday afternoon to the dialog between the President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in New Hampshire. I believe that for the most part, it reaffirmed an observation that I have made on this floor many times, that good people can disagree.

I think there are candidly some profound points of disagreement. But there was one characterization from the President with which I take issue and I thought I would share with you today. During the course of his remarks, the President characterized the

new majority in this House as isolationists. Let me humbly suggest that there is nothing isolationist about putting legitimate American interests first on the world stage. Indeed, our foreign policy should be one that operates under the principle of enlightened self-interest, working together with the international community, through the United Nations, not to place some international creed in a position of preeminence to American policy but to work in concert with other nations, understanding full well our role in the world community as indeed perhaps the world's lone remaining superpower.

I thought the Speaker was very gracious in characterizing the President's efforts in many ways. I think quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is a tribute to our fighting men and women that they can take on missions of great difficulty, such as the one in Haiti, when in essence our fighting men and women were called upon to be social workers in olive drab. They were placed in harm's way not to defend the legitimate interest of the United States but to try and referee a potentially explosive situation.

I thought the Speaker put it succinctly when he described the difficulty in the Bosnian theater confronting the U.N. peacekeeping force. As the Speaker pointed out, military troops are not introduced into a theater to become hostages. They are there to free hostages. They should be there to liberate, not to find themselves enslaved. Indeed, I believe it was that great internationalist President and that great war leader Dwight David Eisenhower who recognized the reality of operating in an international setting within the international community but also said, and it was reflected in his actions in the White House, that we should define our legitimate self-interests.

I applaud the fact that a young pilot, Captain O'Grady, is back out of harm's way. I applaud the efforts once again of our Armed Forces to free him. But again putting Americans in harm's way is not the answer to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, lest there are some who think this is a partisan harangue, let me pause at this juncture to welcome what I believe to be the bipartisan initiative of one of my preceding speakers this morning, the gentleman from Maryland, who once again renewed his call for a lifting of the arms embargo in Bosnia. For in the final analysis, it is the oppressed who must rise against the oppressor to fight for freedom. In the final analysis, it is the legitimate national self-interests of others that help define their place in the world. Again, I take issue with the notion that it is somehow isolationist or xenophobic to always insist that the United States should execute its foreign policy with its legitimate national interests preeminent in the formulation of same.

#### HOUSE DEFENSE BILL SEEKS TO ADD FAT TO DOD BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take the floor to talk about the great debate that is going to be beginning today on the defense bill. We are going to start today on the defense bill, but the real problem is we are not going to be able to do much about the defense bill.

I find this a remarkable situation that we are in really for the first time since I have been here. You see, the President asked for a number, the Pentagon asked for a number, the Senate came up with about the same number. But in the House, they have added \$9.5 billion to that number. We are going to force-feed the Pentagon with all sorts of things they do not even want. The problem is, we are going to get exactly 1 hour to debate on this and this is going to be during the rule, because the rule does not allow any amendments to take that fat out. Seventy-three percent of the amendments offered to the Committee on Rules were denied. Seventy-three percent.

I had an amendment that brought the number back down to the Pentagon number, the President's number, the Senate's number, and that was denied. When this rule is passed today, it is going to hermetically seal the fat in this DOD budget.

I suppose you can say, if you want to, there should be different criteria for the Pentagon than there are other places. But the Pentagon is not even asking for this different criteria. They are saying they can do very well on \$9.5 billion. I think from the example of the last few days with the celebration of O'Grady coming home and being so generous in showing how well trained he was as well as the Marines that picked him up, the Pentagon knows what it is doing, and so why are we insisting we have to add all these pet rocks to the budget at a time when funding is so dear around here?

You have seen all of the pain that has gone on with this cutting in many other areas. If you look at the budget and look at where we are really cutting, we are cutting the things that affect real people, real people, like my family, people who need educational loans, people who need housing, people who need health care, people who want school lunches. Those are the kinds of things we are cutting. Then we are giving the Pentagon things they do not even ask for. Go figure. It does not make any sense at all.

I was looking at some of the things we could do if we had this \$9.5 billion. One of the first things that jumped up is \$9.5 billion would double the amount of biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health. Double it.

Think. What does the average American fear the most? Are they more